REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-16, and 18-20 are pending in the application. Independent claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended to recite that a resolution corresponding to an index of image quality and a sending mode differs from one sending mode to another and differs from one image quality to another. The amendments are fully supported by the application as originally filed (see, e.g., specification at page 20, second paragraph to page 24, first paragraph).

As amended, independent claims 1, 7, and 13 recite that a resolution corresponding to an index of image quality and a sending mode differs from one sending mode to another and differs from one image quality to another. As described in the Applicants' specification, the resolution differs depending on both sending mode and image quality (see, e.g., page 20, second paragraph to page 21, third paragraph). For example, as described on page 21, lines 2-10, even when the same image quality (e.g., "fine") is set for different sending modes, resolutions for the different sending modes cannot be matched, and thus the resolution differs from one image quality to another.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-16, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,488,483 to Murayama et al. ("Murayama") in view of U.S. Patent 5,719,686 to Sakamoto et al. ("Sakamoto"), and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,614,551 to Peek. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 1, 7, and 13 over the proposed combination of Murayama in view of Sakamoto, and further in view of Peek, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest an image sending method and device in which resolution differs from one sending mode to another **and** differs from one image quality to another.

On page 4, lines 5-7 of the Office Action of 05/13/2008, it was admitted that the Murayama reference does not teach or suggest that the resolution differs from one sending mode to another.

On page 4 of the Office Action of 05/13/2008, FIG. 25 of Sakamoto, and column 14, lines 53-56; column 5, lines 47-52; and column 8, lines 44-63 were cited allegedly for disclosing that resolution corresponding to an index of image quality differs from one sending mode to another.

Referring to FIG. 25 of Sakamoto, for a monochrome page, the resolution "varies depending on the super fine mode, fine mode or normal mode." However, for a color page, the resolution remains constant regardless of the selected image quality. See column 14, lines 53-61 of Sakamoto.

In other words, in Sakamoto, monochrome pages are transmitted with different resolution depending on the selected image quality, and color pages are transmitted with the same resolution.

There is no teaching or suggestion in Sakamoto (whether taken alone or combined with Murayama and/or Peek) that resolution differs from one sending mode to another **and** differs from one image quality to another.

Further, in Sakamoto, plural quantizing tables must be registered in advance corresponding to different image qualities (see column 16, lines 61-63), which would undesirably increase storage capacity. However, according to the Applicants' claimed invention, only the resolution is varied and stored.

Therefore, even if Sakamoto was somehow combined with Murayama, and further taken in view of Peek, the proposed combination would not teach or suggest at least that "the resolution corresponding to the index of the image quality and the sending mode differs from one sending mode to another and differs from one image quality to another," as recited in independent claim 1 (*see also* independent claims 7 and 13).

It is believed that the claims are in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Jensen/

Date: August 12, 2008

Steven M. Jensen
(Reg. No. 42,693)
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205

Phone: (617) 239-0100

Customer No. 21874